



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

1/11

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/718,531	11/21/2000	Gary W. Tripp	1770-3-3	2557
7590	10/27/2005			EXAMINER
DAVID A LOWE, ESQ. BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM 701 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 4800 SEATTLE, WA 98104			LU, KUEN S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2167	
			DATE MAILED: 10/27/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/718,531	TRIPP ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kuen S. Lu	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: continuation sheet.

### **Detail Action**

1. This is in response to the Applicant's Amendments, dated May 4, 2005. The Applicant's amendments made to claims 43, 65, 91, 102, 107, 109-110 are accepted and the Examiner's ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*** to the claims is hereby withdrawn.

2. Claims 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 5, 57, 59, 61, 63, 65, 67, 69, 71, 73, 77-110 are pending. For the Examiner's response, please refer to the Office Action for the Final Rejection (hereafter "the Action") as shown below.

Please note the Examiner maintained the same grounds as set forth in the Office Action for non-Final Rejection, dated February 9, 2005, for claims rejection in the Action. Also please note the Action is drafted in response to the Amendments and written in different style with additional description due to change of Examiner for examining the Application.

3. As to Applicant's Remarks, dated May 4, 2005, please see the section ***Response to Arguments*** following the Action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 51, 55, 57, 61, 69, 71, 73, 77-82, 92, 94-95, 97-98, 100 and 104-106 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman et al. ("The Information Specialist's Guide to Searching and Researching on the Internet and the World Wide Web", Karen Hartman, Ernest Ackerman, October 1998, Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, Inc, hereafter "Hartman") in view of Levin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,434,556, hereafter "Levin").

As per claims 15 and 77, Hartman teaches the following:

"running on the cataloging site a program which assembles data relating to objects stored on the two or more source sites where, for each of the two source sites, such data is gathered from a file that is not part of any of said objects and said file contains data entered by said file contains data entered by a human about at least one of said objects" (See Pages 8 and 98 wherein Hartman's web sites are the objects collected by running Yahoo search engine program and the list or file of the web directories about the web sites are collected and maintained by human is equivalent to the Applicant's running on the cataloging site a program which assembles data relating to objects stored on the two or more source sites where, for each of the two source sites, such data is gathered from a file that is not part of any of said objects and said file contains data entered by said file contains data entered by a human about at least one of said objects).

Hartman does not specifically teach "ranking at least some of the assembled data as a function of a set of ranking rules, thereby assigning rankings to the assembled data to generate the catalog of rankings where at least one of the rankings has a value that is

function of said human input data about one or more objects with which the ranking is associated".

However, Levin teaches "ranking at least some of the assembled data as a function of a set of ranking rules, thereby assigning rankings to the assembled data to generate the catalog of rankings where at least one of the rankings has a value that is function of said human input data about one or more objects with which the ranking is associated" (See Figs. 2, 4, col. 7, lines 53-65 and col. 10, lines 13-20 wherein Levin's web query results are ranked and generated ranked matches where options for search result relevance profile is available for user to select for weighting matches is equivalent to the Applicant's ranking at least some of the assembled data as a function of a set of ranking rules, thereby assigning rankings to the assembled data to generate the catalog of rankings where at least one of the rankings has a value that is function of said human input data about one or more objects with which the ranking is associated).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Levin's teaching with Hartman reference by implementing ranking to the web search result because both references are directed to internet searching where the amount and variety of information available are astounding. The combined teaching of the references would have enabled users of both Levin and Hartman's systems to efficiently comprehend the volume and relevance of information located from a web search.

As per claims 17 and 78, the combined teaching of Levin and Hartman references teaches "wherein the data assembled at the two or more source sites is assembled by an agent program running on the source site" (See Hartman: at Pages 188-189 wherein Hartman's agent program searches by using term gap to return and display result of records 1-12 is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein the data assembled at the two or more source sites is assembled by an agent program running on the source site).

As per claims 19 and 79, the combined teaching of Levin and Hartman references teaches "wherein at least one of the rankings has a value that is a function of human usage of the object references" (See Hartman: at Fig. 7.19 and Pages 131 and 194 wherein Hartman's users are allowed to sort the search result as desired, for example, relevance, date and so forth is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein at least one of the rankings has a value that is a function of human usage of the object references).

As per claims 21 and 80, the combined teaching of Levin and Hartman references teaches "wherein some of the assembled data comprises data from the contents of objects on at least one of the source sites" (See Hartman: at Page 198 wherein Hartman's returned object "Brown v. Board of Education" comprises the case in detail from the source site is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein some of the assembled data comprises data from the contents of objects on at least one of the source sites).

As per claims 23 and 81, the combined teaching of Levin and Hartman references teaches "wherein some of the assembled data comprises meta data relating to objects on at least one of the source sites" (See Hartman: at Page 184 wherein Hartman's [See Related Articles] is the metadata linking to the source site for related articles is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein some of the assembled data comprises meta data relating to objects on at least one of the source sites).

As per claims 25 and 82, the combined teaching of Levin and Hartman references teaches "wherein some of the assembled data comprises ratings of objects on the source site" (See Hartman: at Fig. 11.7 and Pages 282-283 wherein Hartman's results browsed are displayed in according to their scores is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein some of the assembled data comprises ratings of objects on the source site).

As per claims 51 and 95, Hartman teaches the following:  
"running on the site a program which processes objects stored on the site, thereby assembling values found in at least one of the objects for comparison to a list of rating values" (See Fig. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 282-283 wherein Hartman's banjo music sites are searched, assembled, sorted, ranked and displayed in according to the scores is equivalent to the Applicant's running on the site a program which processes objects stored on the site, thereby assembling values found in at least one of the objects for comparison to a list of rating values) ;

"generating a rating for each object by relating the values found in the object to the list of rating values" (See Fig. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 282-283 wherein Hartman's banjo music sites are searched, assembled, sorted, whose scores generated and displayed in according to the scores is equivalent to the Applicant's generating a rating for each object by relating the values found in the object to the list of rating values); and

"aggregating the ratings to generate the catalog of ratings" (See Page 98 wherein Hartman's directories for specific subjects are created and maintained and cataloging of rankings was previously described is equivalent to the Applicant's aggregating the ratings to generate the catalog of ratings).

Hartman does not specifically teach "comparing the values found in the object to a list of human input rating values supplied by an owner of the site and stored in a file associated with the site which the file is read by said program".

However, Levin teaches "comparing the values found in the object to a list of human input rating values supplied by an owner of the site and stored in a file associated with the site which the file is read by said program" (See Figs. 2, 4, col. 7, lines 53-65 and col. 10, lines 13-20 wherein Levin's web query results are ranked and generated ranked matches where options for search result relevance profile is available for user to select for weighting matches is equivalent to the Applicant's comparing the values found in the object to a list of human input rating values supplied by an owner of the site and stored in a file associated with the site which the file is read by said program).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Levin's teaching with Hartman reference by

implementing ranking to the web search result because both references are directed to internet searching where the amount and variety of information available are astounding. The combined teaching of the references would have enabled users of both Levin and Hartman's systems to efficiently comprehend the volume and relevance of information located from a web search.

As per claim 92, Hartman teaches the following:

"running on a central computer a program which processes objects stored on the source computers, thereby assembling values found in at least one of the objects for comparison to a list of rating values" (See Fig. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 282-283 wherein Hartman's banjo music sites are searched, assembled, sorted, ranked and displayed in according to the scores is equivalent to the Applicant's running on a central computer a program which processes objects stored on the source computers, thereby assembling values found in at least one of the objects for comparison to a list of rating values);

"generating a rating for each object by relating the values found in the object to a list" (See Fig. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 282-283 wherein Hartman's banjo music sites are searched, assembled, sorted, whose scores generated and displayed in according to the scores is equivalent to the Applicant's generating a rating for each object by relating the values found in the object to a list); and

"aggregating gating the ratings to generate the catalog of ratings" (See Page 98 wherein Hartman's directories for specific subjects are created and maintained and cataloging of

rankings was previously described is equivalent to the Applicant's aggregating the ratings to generate the catalog of rating).

Hartman does not specifically teach "human input rating values supplied by an owner of the site and stored in a file associated with the site which file is read by said program".

However, Levin teaches "human input rating values supplied by an owner of the site and stored in a file associated with the site which file is read by said program" (See Figs. 2, 4, col. 7, lines 53-65 and col. 10, lines 13-20 wherein Levin's web query results are ranked and generated ranked matches where options for search result relevance profile is available for user to select for weighting matches is equivalent to the Applicant's comparing the values found in the object to a list of human input rating values supplied by an owner of the site and stored in a file associated with the site which the file is read by said program).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Levin's teaching with Hartman reference by implementing ranking to the web search result because both references are directed to internet searching where the amount and variety of information available are astounding. The combined teaching of the references would have enabled users of both Levin and Hartman's systems to efficiently comprehend the volume and relevance of information located from a web search.

As per claims 55 and 97, the combined teaching of Levin and Hartman references teaches "wherein he rating values a supplied by a human" (See Levin: See Figs. 2, 4, col. 7, lines 53-65 and col. 10, lines 13-20 wherein Levin's web query results are ranked and

generated ranked matches where options for search result relevance profile is available for user to select for weighting matches is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein he rating values a supplied by a human).

As per claims 57 and 98, the combined teaching of Levin and Hartman references teaches "wherein the-rating values are supplied by a computer" (See Hartman: Figs. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 237-238 wherein Hartman's the searched articles in the list are scored is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein the-rating values are supplied by a computer).

As per claims 61, 94 and 100, the combined teaching of Levin and Hartman references teaches "wherein additional human input rating values are supplied by a host of the site and stored in said file" (See Levin: See Figs. 2, 4, col. 7, lines 53-65 and col. 10, lines 13-20 wherein Levin's web query results are ranked and generated ranked matches where options for search result relevance profile is available for user to select for weighting matches is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein additional human input rating values are supplied by a host of the site and stored in said file).

As per claims 69 and 104, the combined teaching of Levin and Hartman references teaches "wherein the step of processing objects comprises processing meta data for the objects" (See Hartman: at Page 184 wherein Hartman's [See Related Articles] is the metadata linking to the source site for related articles is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein the step of processing objects comprises processing meta data for the objects).

As per claims 71 and 105, the combined teaching of Levin and Hartman references teaches "wherein the list of ratings values is stored on the site" (See Hartman: Figs. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 237-238 wherein Hartman's the searched articles in the list are scored is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein the list of ratings values is stored on the site).

As per claims 73 and 106, the combined teaching of Levin and Hartman references teaches "wherein the list of ratings values is stored on a second site" (See Hartman: Figs. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 237-238 wherein Hartman's the searched articles in the list are scored is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein the list of ratings values is stored on a second site).

7. Claims 27, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 83, 85-91 and 107 are rejected are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman et al. ("The Information Specialist's Guide to Searching and Researching on the Internet and the World Wide Web", Karen Hartman, Ernest Ackerman, October 1998, Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, Inc, hereafter "Hartman").

As per claims 27 and 83, Hartman teaches the following:  
"running on each source site a program which assembles data relating to objects stored on the source site" (See Figs. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 282-283 wherein Hartman's Deja News site assembles banjo music data is equivalent to the Applicant's running on each source site a program which assembles data relating to objects stored on the source site); and

"ranking at least some of the assembled data as a function of a set of ranking rules, thereby assigning rankings to the assembled data" (See Figs. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 282-283 wherein Hartman's Deja News site assembles and scores banjo music data is equivalent to the Applicant's ranking at least some of the assembled data as a function of a set of ranking rules, thereby assigning rankings to the assembled data).

Hartman does not specifically teach "transmitting the rankings from each source site to the cataloging site".

However, Hartman teaches searching and transferring files from archive sites at Pages 224-225, sorting and ranking searched results at Pages 131 and 283 and, creating and maintaining directories.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Hartman teachings of searching, sorting and ranking results, and cataloging directories by distributing the processing of searching, sorting and ranking results at different sites and collecting the final rankings at the catalog site because the amount of information available at the web sites are astounding, and the combination of the teachings would have enabled users efficiently search data from a huge number of sites by distributing system load to a set of multiple search engines and solely interact with a the single catalog site.

Hartman further teaches "aggregating a rankings at the cataloging site to generate a catalog of rankings" (See Page 98 wherein Hartman's directories for specific subjects are created and maintained and cataloging of rankings was previously described is equivalent

to the Applicant's aggregating a rankings at the cataloging site to generate a catalog of rankings).

As per claims 31 and 85, Hartman further teaches "wherein some of the assembled data comprises data from the content of objects on the source site" (See Fig. 5.21 and Page 152 wherein Hartman's the list of searched results 807 EATING DISORDER comprises link <http://...> for the source site is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein some of the assembled data comprises data from the content of objects on the source site).

As per claims 33 and 86, Hartman further teaches "wherein some of the assembled data comprises meta data relating to objects on the source site" (See Hartman: at Page 184 wherein Hartman's [See Related Articles] is the metadata linking to the source site for related articles is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein some of the assembled data comprises meta data relating to objects on the source site).

As per claims 35 and 87, Hartman further teaches "wherein each transmitted ranking is accompanied by a command to the cataloging site instructing the cataloging site what to do with the ranking" (See Figs. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 224-225, 131, 282-283 and 165-166 wherein Hartman's files from archive sites are searched and transferred, and searched results are sorted and ranked and, directories are created and maintained and the relevance ranks selves of the listed sites are suggestions for users to view results is

equivalent to the Applicant's wherein each transmitted ranking is accompanied by a command to the cataloging site instructing the cataloging site what to do with the ranking).

As per claims 37 and 88, Hartman further teaches "wherein the program further assembles object references for objects on the source site, and these object references are transmitted to the cataloging site and aggregated into the catalog on the cataloging site" (See Figs. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 224-225, 131, 282-283 and 98 wherein Hartman's files from archive sites are searched and transferred, and searched results are sorted and ranked and, directories are created and maintained and the relevance ranks and cataloging of rankings was previously described is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein the program further assembles object references for objects on the source site, and these object references are transmitted to the cataloging site and aggregated into the catalog on the cataloging site).

As per claims 39 and 89, Hartman further teaches "wherein the program further transmits to the cataloging site some of the assembled data which is aggregated into the catalog on the cataloging site" (See Figs. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 224-225, 131, 282-283 and 98 wherein Hartman's files from archive sites are searched and transferred, and searched results are sorted and ranked and, directories are created and maintained and the relevance ranks and cataloging of rankings was previously described is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein the program further transmits to the cataloging site some of the assembled data which is aggregated into the catalog on the cataloging site).

As per claims 41 and 90, Hartman further teaches "wherein at least one of the rankings relates to a set of objects on the source site" (See Pages 239 and 260 wherein Hartman's each link comprises of multiple objects and the links are ranked is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein at least one of the rankings relates to a set of objects on the source site).

As per claims 43 and 91, Hartman further teaches "wherein an agent calculates a relationship value representing a distance in text between objects and, at the cataloging site, these relationship values are combined with relationship values from other sites to create a relationship value table representing the likelihood of an object being similar to another object" (See Figs. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 224-225, 131, 282-283 and 98 wherein Hartman's various algorithms for calculating relevancy ranking are utilized to measure the relevance of web pages searched to the search text and files from archive sites are searched and transferred, and searched results are sorted and ranked and, directories are created and maintained and the relevance ranks and cataloging of rankings is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein an agent calculates a relationship value representing a distance in text between objects and, at the cataloging site, these relationship values are combined with relationship values from other sites to create a relationship value table representing the likelihood of an object being similar to another object).

As per claim 107, Hartman teaches the following:

"running on each source site a program which assembles data relating to objects stored on the source site" (See See Figs. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 282-283 wherein Hartman's Deja News site assembles banjo music data is equivalent to the Applicant's running on each source site a program which assembles data relating to objects stored on the source site); and

"ranking at least some of the assembled data as a function of a set of ranking rules, thereby assigning rankings to the assembled data" (See Figs. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 282-283 wherein Hartman's Deja News site assembles and scores banjo music data is equivalent to the Applicant's ranking at least some of the assembled data as a function of a set of ranking rules, thereby assigning rankings to the assembled data).

Hartman does not specifically teach "transmitting the rankings from each source site to the cataloging site".

However, Hartman teaches searching and transferring files from archive sites at Pages 224-225, sorting and ranking searched results at Pages 131 and 283 and, creating and maintaining directories.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Hartman teachings of searching, sorting and ranking results, and cataloging directories by distributing the processing of searching, sorting and ranking results at different sites and collecting the final rankings at the catalog site because the amount of information available at the web sites are astounding, and the combination of the teachings would have enabled users efficiently search data from a huge

number of sites by distributing system load to a set of multiple search engines and solely interact with a the single catalog site.

Hartman further teaches the following:

"aggregating a rankings at the cataloging site to generate a catalog of rankings" (See Page 98 wherein Hartman's directories for specific subjects are created and maintained and cataloging of rankings was previously described is equivalent to the Applicant's aggregating a rankings at the cataloging site to generate a catalog of rankings);

"wherein at least one of the rankings relates to a set of objects on the source site" (See Figs. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 282-283 wherein Hartman's scores are established for the set of banjo music objects is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein at least one of the rankings relates to a set of objects on the source site); and

"wherein an agent calculates a relationship value representing a distance in text between objects and, at the cataloging site, these relationship values are combined with relationship values from other sites to create a relationship value table representing the likelihood of an object being similar to another object" (See Figs. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 224-225, 131, 282-283 and 98 wherein Hartman's various algorithms for calculating relevancy ranking are utilized to measure the relevance of web pages searched to the search text and files from archive sites are searched and transferred, and searched results are sorted and ranked and, directories are created and maintained and the relevance ranks and cataloging of rankings is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein an agent calculates a relationship value representing a distance in text between objects and, at the cataloging site, these relationship values are combined with relationship values from other sites to create a

relationship value table representing the likelihood of an object being similar to another object).

8. Claims 29 and 84 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman et al. ("The Information Specialist's Guide to Searching and Researching on the Internet and the World Wide Web", Karen Hartman, Ernest Ackerman, October 1998, Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, Inc, hereafter "Hartman") as applied to claims 27 and 83 rejection above and further in view of Levin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,434,556, hereafter "Levin").

As per claims 29 and 84, Hartman teaches ranking and scoring of searched results as previously described in claims 17 and 83 rejection.

Hartman does not specifically teach "wherein at least one of the rankings has a value that is a function of human input data about one or more objects with which the ranking is associated where the human input data is stored in a file on the source site which file is not a part of said one or more objects and assembled by said program".

However, Levin teaches "wherein at least one of the rankings has a value that is a function of human input data about one or more objects with which the ranking is associated where the human input data is stored in a file on the source site which file is not a part of said one or more objects and assembled by said program" (See Figs. 2, 4, col. 7, lines 53-65 and col. 10, lines 13-20 wherein Levin's web query results are ranked and generated ranked matches where options for search result relevance profile is available for user to select for weighting matches is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein at least one of the rankings has a value that is a function of human input data about one or more objects

with which the ranking is associated where the human input data is stored in a file on the source site which file is not a part of said one or more objects and assembled by said program).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Levin's teaching with Hartman reference by implementing ranking to the web search result because both references are directed to internet searching where the amount and variety of information available are astounding. The combined teaching of the references would have enabled users of both Levin and Hartman's systems to efficiently comprehend the volume and relevance of information located from a web search.

9. Claims 53, 59, 93 and 96 are rejected are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman et al. ("The Information Specialist's Guide to Searching and Researching on the Internet and the World Wide Web", Karen Hartman, Ernest Ackerman, October 1998, Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, Inc, hereafter "Hartman") in view of Levin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,434,556, hereafter "Levin"), as applied to claims 51, 92 and 95 rejection above, and further in view of Culliss (U.S. Patent 6,078,916).

As per claims 53, 93 and 96, the combined teaching of Levin and Hartman teaches ranking and scoring of searched results as previously described in claims 51 and 95 rejection.

The combined teaching of Levin and Hartman does not specifically teach "wherein each of the rating comprises a word".

However, Culliss teaches "wherein each of the rating comprises a word" (See col. 18, lines 48-51 wherein Culliss' articles are rated as 'X-Rated" and 'G-Rated' is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein each of the rating comprises a word).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Culliss' teaching with Levin and Hartman references by rating internet article by words because all three references are directed to internet searching where the amount and variety of information available are astounding. The combined teaching of the references would have enabled users of internet to efficiently reduce and comprehend the volume by using word which users can directly connect for searching only the volume as the rating word rated.

As per claim 59, the combined teaching of Culliss, Levin and Hartman references further teaches "wherein generating ratings of the objects comprises comparing the values found in the object to a list of human input rating values supplied by an owner of the site and stored in a file associated with the site which file is read by said program" (See Culliss: col. 18, lines 45-67 wherein Culliss' rating key terms are incorporated into the index of key terms and included in the association of comparison score and probability score where articles are rated and scored with the key terms by human judgment or default association is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein generating ratings of the objects comprises comparing the values found in the object to a list of human input rating values supplied by

an owner of the site and stored in a file associated with the site which file is read by said program).

10. Claims 63, 65, 67 and 101-103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman et al. ("The Information Specialist's Guide to Searching and Researching on the Internet and the World Wide Web", Karen Hartman, Ernest Ackerman, October 1998, Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, Inc, hereafter "Hartman") in view of Levin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,434,556, hereafter "Levin"), as applied to claims 51 and 95 rejection above, and further in view of Cragun et al. (U.S. Patent 5,973,683, hereafter "Cragun").

As per claims 63 and 101, the combined teaching of Levin and Hartman teaches ranking and scoring of searched results as previously described in claims 51 and 95 rejection.

The combined teaching of Levin and Hartman does not specifically teach "wherein generating a rating comprises generating a ratings flag when the values found in the object indicate a first rating for the object and at least one of the values from an owner of the site or a host of the site indicates a second rating for the object different than the first rating"

However, Cragun teaches "wherein generating a rating comprises generating a ratings flag when the values found in the object indicate a first rating for the object and at least one of the values from an owner of the site or a host of the site indicates a second rating for the object different than the first rating" (See col. 14, line 47 - col. 15, line 4 wherein Cragun's hybrid rating consists of sex and violence is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein generating a rating comprises generating a ratings flag when the values found in the object

indicate a first rating for the object and at least one of the values from an owner of the site or a host of the site indicates a second rating for the object different than the first rating).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Cragun's teaching with Levin and Hartman references by rating internet article by words because all three references are directed to searching and presentation of articles where the amount and variety of information available are astounding and effective solutions are needed for family to effective control family's viewing of articles. The combined teaching of the references would have enabled users of multi-media to efficiently reduce and comprehend the volume by using hybrid rating which users can automatically search and control only the volume as the hybrid rating rated.

As per claims 67 and 103, the combined teaching of Cragun, Levin and Hartman references further teaches "wherein aggregating ratings includes triggering a human review indicator for review by a human of objects having rating flags to determine the correct ratings for the objects" (See Cragun: col. 14, line 47 - col. 15, line 4 wherein Cragun's hybrid rating consists of sex and violence and parent's manual reset of threshold values for rating is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein aggregating ratings includes triggering a human review indicator for review by a human of objects having rating flags to determine the correct ratings for the objects).

As per claims 67 and 103, the combined teaching of Cragun, Levin and Hartman references further teaches "wherein aggregating ratings includes triggering a computer review of objects having rating flags to determine the correct ratings for the objects" (See Cragun: col. 14, line 47 - col. 15, line 4 wherein Cragun's hybrid rating consists of sex and violence and parent's manual reset of threshold values for rating is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein aggregating ratings includes triggering a computer review of objects having rating flags to determine the correct ratings for the objects).

11. Claims 108-110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman et al. ("The Information Specialist's Guide to Searching and Researching on the Internet and the World Wide Web", Karen Hartman, Ernest Ackerman, October 1998, Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, Inc, hereafter "Hartman") in view of Cragun et al. (U.S. Patent 5,973,683, hereafter "Cragun").

As per claims 108 -110, Hartman teaches the following:  
"running on the site a program which processes objects stored on the site, thereby assembling values found in at least one of the objects for comparison to a list of rating values" (See Fig. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 282-283 wherein Hartman's banjo music sites are searched, assembled, sorted, ranked and displayed in according to the scores is equivalent to the Applicant's running on the site a program which processes objects stored on the site, thereby assembling values found in at least one of the objects for comparison to a list of rating values);

"generating a rating for each object by relating the values found in the object to the list of rating values" (See Fig. 11.6-11.7 and Pages 282-283 wherein Hartman's banjo music sites are searched, assembled, sorted, whose scores generated and displayed in according to the scores is equivalent to the Applicant's generating a rating for each object by relating the values found in the object to the list of rating values); and

"aggregating the ratings to generate the catalog of ratings" (See Page 98 wherein Hartman's directories for specific subjects are created and maintained and cataloging of rankings was previously described is equivalent to the Applicant's aggregating the ratings to generate the catalog of ratings).

Hartman neither specifically teach "wherein generating a rating comprises generating a ratings flag when the values found in the object indicate a first rating for the object and at least one of the values from an owner of the site or a host of the site indicates a second rating for the object different than the first rating" nor "wherein aggregating ratings includes triggering a computer review of objects having flags to determine the correct ratings for the objects" nor "triggering a human review indicator for review by a human of objects having rating flags to determine the correct ratings for the objects".

However, Cragun teaches the element by the following:

"wherein generating a rating comprises generating a ratings flag when the values found in the object indicate a first rating for the object and at least one of the values from an owner of the site or a host of the site indicates a second rating for the object different than the first rating" (See col. 14, line 47 - col. 15, line 4 wherein Cragun's hybrid rating consists of sex and violence is equivalent to the Applicant's wherein generating a rating comprises

generating a ratings flag when the values found in the object indicate a first rating for the object and at least one of the values from an owner of the site or a host of the site indicates a second rating for the object different than the first rating);

“wherein aggregating ratings includes triggering a computer review of objects having flags to determine the correct ratings for the objects” (See col. 14, line 47 - col. 15, line 4 wherein Cragun’s hybrid rating consists of sex and violence and parent’s manual reset of threshold values for rating is equivalent to the Applicant’s wherein aggregating ratings includes triggering a computer review of objects having flags to determine the correct ratings for the objects) ; and

“triggering a human review indicator for review by a human of objects having rating flags to determine the correct ratings for the objects” (See col. 14, line 47 - col. 15, line 4 wherein Cragun’s hybrid rating consists of sex and violence and parent’s manual reset of threshold values for rating is equivalent to the Applicant’s triggering a human review indicator for review by a human of objects having rating flags to determine the correct ratings for the objects).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Cragun's teaching with Hartman reference by rating internet article by words because both references are directed to searching and presentation of articles where the amount and variety of information available are astounding and effective solutions are needed for family to effective control family's viewing of articles. The combined teaching of the references would have enabled users of multi-

media to efficiently reduce and comprehend the volume by using hybrid rating which users can automatically search and control only the volume as the hybrid rating rated.

***Response to Arguments***

**12.** Applicant's arguments with respect to claims rejection by the Examiner's Office Action of May 4, 2005 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

**Conclusions**

**13.** The prior art made of record

U. The Information Specialist's Guide to Searching and Researching on the Internet and the World Wide Web", Karen Hartman, Ernest Ackerman, October 1998, Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, Inc.

A. U.S. Patent No. 6,434,556

B. U.S. Patent No. 6,078,916

C. U.S. Patent No. 5,973,683

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

D. U.S. Patent No. 6,295,559

E. U.S. Patent No. 6,385,602

F. U.S. Patent No. 6,785,671

**Contact information**

**14.** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuen S. Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4114. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30 am-5:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone pre unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jean R. Homere, Esq. can be reached on (571) 272-3780. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for Page 13 published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 886-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kuen S. Ly  
*rla*  
Patent Examiner

October 11, 2005

Jean R. Homere, Esq.  
Supervisory Patent Examiner

October 11, 2005

*John E. Greene*  
JOHN GREENE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100